International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Volume 11 | Number 1 Article 4

January 2017

The Triple Flip: Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing

Zeina Hojeij
Zayed University, Zeina.Hojeij@zu.ac.ae

Zoe Hurley
Zayed University, Zoe.Hurley@zu.ac.ae

Recommended Citation
Hojeij, Zeina and Hurley, Zoe (2017) "The Triple Flip: Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing," *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 11: No. 1, Article 4.
Available at: https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2017.110104

The Triple Flip: Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing

Abstract
Many teachers consider themselves digital immigrants who struggle to keep up with student digital natives. Whether or not this dichotomy still holds true, in a 21st Century context of teaching and learning, is debatable not least of all because of the exponential development of apps and mobile learning technology. Nevertheless, it is sometimes difficult for educators to know where to begin and for students to know how best to use it to advance their studies and improve their writing.

Focusing on university students at a pre-university English as Second Language (ESL) program in Dubai, this paper discusses how mobile learning and the use of a range of apps can foster peer and self-editing, aid noticing and enhance ownership of the writing process. It is argued that flipping corrective feedback helps students to notice their errors and spend more time developing their writing.

Keywords
Peer editing, Self-editing, Mobile technology, Flipped learning

The Triple Flip: Using Technology for Peer and Self-Editing of Writing

Zeina Hojeij[1] and Zoe Hurley[2]
[1]College of Education, Zayed University, Dubai, United Arab Emirates
[2]Academic Bridge Program, Zayed University, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

(Received 23 September 2015; Accepted 08 December 2016)

Many teachers consider themselves digital immigrants who struggle to keep up with student digital natives. Whether or not this dichotomy still holds true, in a 21st Century context of teaching and learning, is debatable not least of all because of the exponential development of apps and mobile learning technology. Nevertheless, it is sometimes difficult for educators to know where to begin and for students to know how best to use it to advance their studies and improve their writing. Focusing on university students at a pre-university English as Second Language (ESL) program in Dubai, this paper discusses how mobile learning and the use of a range of apps can foster peer and self-editing, aid noticing and enhance ownership of the writing process. It is argued that flipping corrective feedback helps students to notice their errors and spend more time developing their writing.

INTRODUCTION

The research initially focused on the apps Explain Everything, Notability and Edmodo which were explored to facilitate peer and self-editing to enhance ownership of the writing process. Subsequently, following an initial pilot, and in view of the expanding market of apps, the paper incorporates apps that are categorized according to function. These include: Powtoon, Thinglink, Showbie, Schoology and others. The overall process is termed the 'Triple Flip' and seeks to integrate self and peer editing processes with authentic publishing opportunities.

The limitations of teacher driven corrective feedback on ESL student writing have been extensively studied as has research emphasizing the value of student self-editing based on the Noticing Hypothesis. When teachers provide corrective written feedback highlighting learners' weaknesses, the process is passive. The Noticing Hypothesis states "SLA is largely driven by what learners pay attention to and notice in TL input and what they understand the significance of noticed input to be" (Iwanaka & Takatskuka, 2007, p, 57). Essentially, Schmidt came up with the Noticing Hypothesis based on his own personal experiences as an adult learner of Portuguese. As a result, he hypothesized that only when L2 learners become aware of the linguistic form in the input, do they begin to acquire it. His basic claim is that input can only be acquired once the learner notices it, which is when it is consciously registered. Schmidt & Frota (1986) indicate that being exposed to information in class is not enough for input to be retained and/or used. They argue that it is a must for the learner to consciously notice and become aware of the input structures in order to be able to use them. As such, their L2 premise is that there is no L2 learning without conscious noticing. Relating to the current research project, learners were given the opportunity to notice their errors in writing through the use of the mobile apps for their self and peer editing.

With the development of mobile learning there has been a huge interest in flipped learning. Teachers have been encouraged to make videos and presentations that learners can access outside the classroom. However, it is debatable to what extent this is student-centered, proactive or beneficial. Also it is incredibly time consuming on behalf of teachers. Conversely, the study arises out of concerns over the extent to which mobile technology really enhances learning and which theoretical basis it stems from. It could be argued that the emphasis still seems to be on the teacher rather than being student centered. Other concerns are that technology is diluting learning and that mobile learning practices are a kind of 'tech fluff' or 'edutainment.'

The research therefore investigates how mobile learning and the use of a range of apps aid peer and self-editing, enhance noticing, improve writing and increase student ownership. It considered how the structuring of app architecture facilitated a cascade of peer and self-editing processes to develop writing as well as providing authentic publishing opportunities.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Although the limitations of teacher driven corrective feedback on student writing have been extensively studied, as has research emphasizing the value of student self-editing based on the Noticing Hypothesis, there is currently very little in-depth research relating to the use of apps to improve academic writing.

Whilst students may have a lack of knowledge about how to improve their writing in a second language, some teachers could be doubtful or lack the skills to use technology to help students peer and self-edit. Nevertheless, 21st Century teaching and learning are reframing traditional pedagogies, contexts for learning as well as the direction and reception of knowledge.

Therefore, it is within this spirit that a discussion of how a layering of apps, or a construction of app architecture, can create a dynamic learning environment for students to improve their own writing through increasing their autonomy and sense of control. The process, termed 'The Triple Flip,' was not seeking to replicate traditional pedagogies but aimed to harness technology to create new structures and training for peer and self-editing of writing. The learning process is not restricted to the classroom or bound within traditional hierarchies of teacher – student control and reception. Potentially, flipping corrective feedback therefore becomes a win-win situation for both teachers and learners by using technology to create new structures and processes for noticing, improving and sharing written work.

Innovation and Value of the Triple Flip

The Triple Flip has a number of key affordances that foster innovative digital collaboration between learners and teachers. It offers greater interactions between learners and teachers in a manner that overrides the (imagined) division between digital natives and immigrants.

https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2017.110104

Simultaneously, the approach provides a structure for shifting traditional writing activities of the classroom from an individual to a collaborative process. These processes are more representative of the transactional and collaborative writing tasks that students will engage with in the workplace and situate learning within the social construction of knowledge (Kalin, 2012).

The digital tools utilized in the process, incorporating both synchronous and asynchronous features, provide an articulation of structured digital collaborative activities for producing, processing and sharing writing that are not bounded temporally or spatially.

Participants

The participants are female students at Zayed University, Dubai who are in the Academic Bridge Program studying English as a Second Language. In order to exit the course they need to gain a Band 5 in IELTS. They are first language Arabic speakers and are of Emirati nationality. A large proportion of the students are the first members of their families to enroll in a university education.

Class Make-up

Two groups of students were involved in the study. All participants were females whose native language is Arabic. The learners were all enrolled in a foundations English program at university. Their ages ranged between 18-21 years old. All the students in this study were of Arabic ethnicity with no differences in their nationalities. All participants had their own iPads with the necessary apps for this study. As part of the students' class objectives, they were required to write a problem-solution essay referencing external sources of reading and listening. These essays served as the content for the current research.

The first group consisted of pre-intermediate learners of English with a current IELTS Band 3 – 5. 17 students took part in process and were interviewed in both Arabic and English. The second group involved 15 students who received 20 contact hours of core English per week. The students were all in the same class for the full semester term with one instructor.

It is worth noting that levels of literacy in the United Arab Emirates have accelerated since independence in 1971 and a huge investment in education subsequently. Female education is also a high priority of Emiratisation and there is a real sense that educating Emirati females will be a huge benefit to the nation. (MFNCA, 2009).

Research Questions

The study was conducted in three stages reflecting the teaching and seeks to answer the following questions:

RQ1. How effective are apps that allow teachers to flip the learning environment and provide materials and videos offering careful cues and models in guiding students' peer and self-editing through structure, content and language?

RQ2. How helpful are app features such as annotation, voice commentaries and stickies in engaging students in the peer and self-editing process?

RQ3. How could apps and mobile learning platforms, such as *Edmodo* and *Schoology*, provide authentic publishing platforms, audience and peer discussion forums to motivate learners to improve their writing?

Whilst there was a use of a range of apps, the research was not app specific but rather concerned with the processes of how mobile learning technology could be harnessed to structure a more purposeful and process based approach to writing.

Hypothesis

The expected outcomes of the project are higher student engagement and motivation due to the ubiquitous features of mobile learning, a stronger sense of autonomy and control over the academic writing process. Furthermore, a general improvement to the students' academic writing was anticipated due to the socially collective practice of peer editing, forum discussions and authentic publication opportunities.

Review of the Literature

Drawing on insights from Interactionist approaches to language and the Noticing Hypothesis, we believe that mobile applications can be effective tools for self-editing writing as they aid the students in noticing errors; assist acquisition and encourage learner ownership and autonomy.

In terms of SLA, learners must be exposed to appropriate input to produce accurate output. Van Lier (1996), drawing on Vygotsky (1978) advances three essential affective factors for this input and output thesis, which include awareness: autonomy and authenticity. To achieve these variables, Van Lier stresses peer interaction is essential to provide the necessary scaffolding and motivation.

In terms of writing pedagogy, teacher driven corrective input is arguably one-way and whilst highlighting learners' errors, the process is passive on the behalf of students and does not necessarily develop their autonomous output.

Researchers such as Schmidt (2010) claim the learning process is incomplete unless it includes noticing. Teachers need to raise students' awareness of their errors by providing an atmosphere for noticing and learn the difference between the produced interlanguage forms and the target language forms.

To achieve Van Lier's (1996, 2014) principles of awareness, autonomy and authenticity, learning outside the classroom is as important, if not more so, than within. Van Lier believes learners should be given more control of what, how and when they want to learn. At the same time, students need to be guided in learning to notice their errors. A possible solution therefore is to draw on developments in mobile learning. The concept of the flipped classroom be integrated to facilitate students in learning to notice their errors, during peer or self-editing, so that they can work autonomously beyond the classroom.

Flipped classes are a relatively new phenomenon in education. The idea of flipped instruction began about 12 years ago with the integration of technology into the classroom methodology by a few technologically savvy educators. According to Thompson (2011), flipped classes became popular because of Samuel Khan who tried to teach math to his younger relatives online. In order to do so, he developed instructional videos for them and uploaded them online for later viewing. As he developed more and more videos, he eventually developed his own website Khan Academy and has ever since become the symbol of this new teaching approach.

The flipped approach to teaching and learning has become so popular because of the vast availability of resources online. Students relate to it because of the technological appeal and teachers relate to it because it frees up class time for individualized instruction (Herreid & Schiller, 2013). In essence, the flipped model switches between what is done in class and what is done at home. So, instead of students listening to lectures in class then doing the practice at home, they read/watch the materials before coming to class and then engage in active learning while in class. By inverting the traditional manner in which teaching/learning has always been, the roles of the learners and their instructors have also shifted.

As with any other approach to teaching and learning, the flipped classroom has its advantages as well as its disadvantages. According to Fulton (2012), the benefits of the flipped class can be listed in a few points. In the flipped class the students learn at their own pace; the teachers get a deeper awareness of their students' learning preferences as a result of covering the homework in class; the teachers can easily customize input and make it ubiquitously available to their particular students; classroom time is used more efficiently on active learning; there is an increase in student motivation, engagement and results, and finally the use of technology is flexible and applicable in the 21st century learning setting. When it comes to the drawbacks, Herreid & Schiller (2013) identify two major problems. First, many students who are not familiar with the flipped model might be apprehensive and resistant to it because it requires them to do work on their own at home. That is why many might come to class unprepared, which will defeat the whole purpose of flipping the class. Also, the input materials must be carefully tailored to the needs of the specific group of students. Finding high quality online resources can be challenging for some teachers and so they have to resort to creating their own.

The current research study investigated the impact of flipped teaching on students' process writing. The working hypothesis was that student engagement would increase in classroom academic writing activities, that in-depth peer editing would augment student noticing and understanding of their own errors and accountability would be heightened by having to publish their work in an open forum under the attention from peers and from the teacher. It was anticipated that students' academic writing performance would improve, and that errors would decrease as a result of self and peer editing.

Support for the use of peer editing in process writing instruction can be found in Vygotsky's theory on learning (1962, 1878). To Vygotsky, social interaction is an essential element of cognitive learning. Learning takes place in social settings and collaboration. By the same token, writing is a learning activity in which the learners can learn best through social interaction with peers. "Peer review provides opportunities for literacy learning because reviewers and writers vary in their strengths, preferred modes of expression, and levels of competence" (Min, 2005, p. 294). With that being said, pairing students with different abilities helps both learners to increase each other's writing proficiency. As a result, development will occur through peer review when the learners interact positively in oral and written communication that includes asking questions, providing feedback, and instructing on error correction.

A review of research conducted on peer editing shows that training enhances the experience and efficiency of peer evaluation. Learners who received training on how to edit and review had a more rewarding overall experience as they were able to generate more valuable feedback and to engage in more active interaction thus resulting in a more beneficial process (Zhu, 1995; Stanley, 1992). Peer feedback can be supported and justified by the process writing theory, the collaborative learning theory, and the sociocultural theory. Each of these theories emphasizes peer response as a major component in helping learners improve their writing. Peer editing and feedback not only helps learners to revise their writing, but it also gives them a sense of audience, which makes the process writing experience more purposeful, meaningful, and communicative (Rahimi, 2013). Rahimi explains that peer feedback is more attuned with the students' level of proficiency than teacher feedback. That is why it is more manageable for the students to apply, as it is also less threatening and more specific and effective for revision at times.

Kalin (2012) states that in the modern classroom, students have the technological aptitude and flexibility; however, they lack awareness of purpose. They do not know or realize how they are learning from the integration of the various digital tools they use in class. Kalin calls this technical dexterity vs. rhetorical dexterity. Kalin indicates that it is the teachers' mission to provide the students with this awareness in order for them to become more than just users, but actual "producers of content" (p.2).

To achieve this, teachers must educate their students in the "multiliteracies of technology – functional, critical, and rhetorical" in order to involve them in the conversation about the use of technology (Kalin, 2012, p.2). This is achievable through the use of collaborative technologies in the classroom, which in turn will prepare the students for collaboration in the real world. Kalin explains, "Collaborative learning promotes knowing, thinking and acting in the classroom by encouraging students to converse with each other, and to search each other for meaning. In the process, students foster a community of common understanding and respect, belonging and camaraderie" (p.3).

By considering the way in which students already communicate in modern times, technology and collaborative learning have become intertwined. As such, no collaboration in the modern classroom is complete without technology. What teachers must keep in mind is the importance of teaching their students how to collaborate. Collaboration must be purposeful and intentional and as such, there are certain skills to be scaffolded prior to collaboration.

To sum up, flipping the writing process to include collaborative peer editing and feedback is an effective practice for teaching academic process writing. The literature indicates that training is necessary in order for the learners to give useful feedback on content and language structure. Moreover, the interaction between the editor and the writer can lead to long-term improvements in the quality of writing. The marriage between the flipped method and peer editing can have advantageous results on the process of writing provided the learners are exposed to enough training.

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative research methods were triangulated to include data collected from a survey, unstructured interviews, narrative practices and observations of the students' writing at each stage of the research. The central issue of the research was to investigate how students may take a more active role in the assessment of their writing and how the range of apps could function as a tool to facilitate this. Student experiences were at the center of the project to ensure that the initiative was dialogic and learners'

https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2017.110104

interpretations were paramount.

Data Collection

Firstly, students completed a survey questioning them on three stages of the writing process. This survey consisted of attitudinal questions to gather data about their subjective responses. Secondly, they engaged in unstructured interviews, in both English and Arabic, so they could reflect verbally on their experiences of the process. Thirdly, writing samples they had produced individually were compared with the writing they developed through the stages of The Triple Flip process. The researchers felt that this triangulation was important to preserve both subjectivities of the students whilst maintaining a robust and empirical quality to the project.

Process

The initial pilot of the project surveyed students across three stages of being taught a discursive essay. Findings from the pilot indicated that the students needed to be guided more carefully in the editing process and to be given clear instructions about what skill they editing for. As a result, a series of editing activities were developed that involved a checklist of processes that included: micro-editing for grammatical issues as well as macro concerns including structure and organization; content and ideas; style and register.

A further issue arising out of the pilot was that not all of the students had access to the app Notability since it is not free. It was therefore decided that this app could be substituted for the free app Educreations. As a result, it was also revealed that the focus of the study should not be app specific but rather be about the process of using a range of apps to carry out a specific editing, reviewing, drafting and publishing activities.

In the next stage of the study, students were engaged in the same triple staged process of receiving: input through Powtoon videos; peer, self and teacher conferencing editing and reviewing and then having their writing published on Edmodo for discussion and showcasing. A detailed description of the process can be found in the following steps:

Flip 1: Input with Powtoon

The first flip consisted of input writing videos using the video-making platform Powtoon, accessed at www.powtoon.com. Powtoon is a fun and user-friendly tool for making presentations and videos in a cartoon manner. The website offers a range of educational templates, which were used to create input for this project. It is possible for users to create videos using the free templates offered if they do not wish to pay for a subscription. The videos created using the free templates include the website's logo and jingle at the end of each video, while the videos under the paid subscription do not.

The researchers designed and created a series of short videos based on topics related to the curriculum of the course being taught. The Powtoon videos ranged in length from 3-5 minutes and did not include any voice instructions. All instruction was based on reading; no voice was used in the videos. A total of 10 videos were made and shared with the students by email as mp4 attachments. Powtoon templates allowed for flexibility in design to fit the various themes presented. After going through all the videos and brainstorming for their essays, the students were asked to write their first drafts using Microsoft Word.

Flip 2: The Notability Process

The second step of the process, or the second flip, involved using the app Notability to peer edit each other's work. Notability is a paid app, which is required at our institution for all the students as part of their program. As such, the app was chosen for the editing process. Notability allows for the annotation of PDFs using highlighters, text notes, sticky notes and voice notes.

The students were paired up and asked to email their drafts to each other. Notability allows the students to view their partners' essays in PDF format as email attachments. They reviewed each other's essays and gave recorded verbal feedback and written comments on the work. The app allowed for easy collaboration as the participants could review audio comments linked to their written feedback they receive.

After the feedback, the students met for peer editing sessions in class and the revisions were discussed in detail to clarify all points of feedback. The teachers at this point were monitoring the discussions and pair meetings to make sure everyone was adhering to the requirements of the assignment. At this stage, all work is student-centered with remote teacher supervision. Once this was concluded, the students were then asked to write their second drafts based on the peer feedback they had received. Their second drafts were published in Edmodo for class sharing as the Third Flip.

Flip 3: The Edmodo Process

The third flip involved publishing the edited essays in Edmodo. Edmodo is a social networking site with layout and design features similar to Facebook. With more than 6.5 million users, it hosts webfeeds educational resources, discussion forums and features for uploading profile pictures, text, video, and app links (Trust, 2012).

In terms of collaborative writing opportunities, and the Triple Flip process, group codes can be assigned to individual classes or groups so that online activity is secure. Assignments can be issued to students, which can then be shared with either the teacher or the whole group.

Written work can be published on Edmodo throughout varying stages of the drafting process. Features for annotating text allow collaborative amendments, comments and feedback so that writing becomes an iterative process. The authentic publishing opportunities afforded by Edmodo increase the audience for students' writing, thereby raising the communicative stakes.

Conversely, the features of Edmodo adhere to the three-pronged pedagogical strategy outlined by Selbeer (2004) incorporating functional, critical and rhetorical literacies. In terms of functional digital literacy, Edmodo is a tool for publishing, editing, reviewing and collaborating on written texts. As a means of critical digital literacy, Edmodo emphasizes writing as a cultural artifact that students collectively and individually critique and reflect upon. For rhetorical digital literacy, Edmodo facilitates hypertextual media and students as producers of texts with the objective of reflective praxis.

Once the students published their second drafts in Edmodo, the whole class had a chance to read and comment on each other's submissions for further editing. They added comments, voice notes, and annotations to others' essays. There were also some interesting class discussions that came about naturally from the essays. In the third flip, the researchers/teachers monitored the forum and participated in the discussions to prompt certain points for further considerations. Learners were then asked to finalize their drafts taking into concern the peer editing comments and tips from the Third Flip. Finally, as a last step, learners submitted their edited essays for a grade.

To sum, the Triple Flip writing process facilitates functional, critical and rhetorical digital literacies by sharing the collaborations that have occurred through the work conducted in Powtoon and Notability. Edmodo provides the platform for the app bound digital writing and peer review processes to be showcased, catalogued and integrated. This enables app integration as well as learner and teacher-learner interconnections.

DATA RESULTS AND ANALYSES

Group 1: Results of the survey and unstructured interviews

In response to the question of whether enough writing models were provided, the feedback was generally positive with 79% answering that a good number of examples were given. Conversely, 14% answered that there were too many models and an equal 14% also said there were not enough. These variables relate to individual differences with the majority of the group responding favorably to the use of written models.

Opinions relating to the use of video support for writing, 71% found the videos useful although only 14% said they watched them outside the classroom. In terms of the flipped classroom concept, this variable indicates that learning was occurring within the traditional classroom context rather than beyond on a mobile device. What is not known is whether they would have viewed the videos outside the classroom if they did not the opportunity to watch them within.

In terms of the editing apps, Notability and Educreations for peer and self-editing, 57% said that they found the apps useful. 7% found them very useful and 35% found them a waste of time. In the unstructured interviews and discussions, students remarked that that found the apps cumbersome and disliked the voice recording since it made them self-conscious. As regards peer editing, responses were far more positive with 14% finding the process very useful; 78% finding it useful and 14% finding it a waste of time. So whilst some of the students were skeptical about the particular apps and their specific features they were enthusiastic about the process they facilitated. This indicates more user-friendly apps should be found. It also suggests that students need to be consulted in terms of app selection and their preferences should be considered. In terms of the overall study, the feature of the Triple Flip is that it is process rather app specific.

The study was based on the premise that traditional teacher corrective feedback was a passive activity on behalf of students. However, 71% of students found the written corrective feedback very useful and 28% found it useful. No students found the written corrections a waste of time. In terms of the teacher's voice recorded feedback, 35% found it very useful; 57% found it useful and 7% found it a waste of time. These results highlight that this sample value teacher response to writing in both written and verbal forms.

In terms of the learning platform Edmodo, both the unstructured interviews and the survey indicated a very positive response to the authentic publishing opportunities the website provided. 90% said that they found Emodo very useful and 10% said it was useful. One student, said that sharing her work with the rest of the class in this format made her take more care with her writing and she checked it more carefully than if she had been handing it in solely to the teacher.

This response to Edmodo also reinforces that the students react favorably to the use of technology in the editing process but the technology has to be intuitive and purposeful. What remains unclear, however, is whether the students would have developed more positive responses to the apps Notability and Educreations once they had become more familiar with its functions?

In terms of whether students felt their writing had improved through the Triple Flip process, 28% said their writing was much better and 78% said it had improved. Nobody in the sample felt that it had not improved. Attitudes about what had helped their writing to improve were interesting since only 14% felt that peer editing was useful; 35% felt that using technology had helped and 78% felt that teacher feedback was the most important factor. These results could indicate that traditional teacher feedback is the most important factor for improving writing. Alternatively, it could indicate that the students held traditional perceptions of what factors influenced development. Conversely, a combination of traditional teacher driven feedback, peer review and technology are all significant variables that help students improve their written work.

An analysis of students' writing samples did provide evidence of improvements in students work. These improvements were particularly in terms of content and style although the same number and type of grammatical errors were still occurring. Their ability to discuss their writing with one another and with the teacher also developed as the students started to acquire a meta-language or critical criteria for assessing their writing.

Group 2: Results of Unstructured Interviews

The results demonstrate that the majority of the students enjoyed the overall experience of peer and self-editing as 53% indicated that it was an interesting and engaging way to approach the writing process. Interestingly, they stated that the process helped them to find their own mistakes. Looking at the results specifically, 56% found the peer editing useful explaining that they felt it improved their writing by increasing their ability to notice their own mistakes.

As for the apps themselves, only 46% found Notability helpful in the editing process. Many expressed their dislike of this app as opposed to their contentment with Edmodo and Powtoon. Edmodo was the favorite of the three chosen apps with 40% of the students indicating they enjoyed using it especially because it allowed them to read each other's work and to comment and give feedback. The discussion platform was a major motivator in their re-writing process. 67% said they benefited the most from allowing their classmates to read their work and comment on it in Edmodo. 33% found the Powtoon videos to be useful as a reference as well as quite attractive. Only 27% were in favor of using Notability for the recording and editing.

Regarding their confidence at editing their own writing after going through the training for this project, 60% answered they felt quite sure of their ability to edit their own work for language as well as content. They explained that the training provided allowed for noticing certain errors, which they hadn't been aware of earlier. When it comes to their least favorite experiences during this process, 60% said correcting, 30% disliked rewriting their essays, and 10% did not enjoy explaining and discussing the errors with their classmates. There was a general view that more preparation was necessary before actually editing the essays.

https://doi.org/10.20429/ijsotl.2017.110104

Finally, according to our students' answers, this experience of the writing process could be improved by offering more training and practice on how to edit, as they were not confident in their abilities as self and peer-editors. Also, they did not like having different partners in different stages of the re-drafting process. Instead, they preferred having the same editing partners throughout.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

The limitations of the study are size of the sample and relatively short period of time over which the study was conducted. Recommendations for future research would include a longer research period and comparisons with other classes and across other academic disciplines.

The next cycle would be for students to create their own Powtoons and videos in order to create their own content for learning. Ideally, teaching should also be flipped, and not just learning in order to make the whole process more student-centered.

Further avenues of research would also involve looking at teachers' perceptions of the Triple Flip process and possible questions could be how they view their shifting role in the 21st Century 'wall-less' classroom. How do they feel about the erosion of the traditional teacher – student hierarchy? Do they feel that students' writing is improving through this process? Another issue would their perceptions of managing the peer and self-editing process. What are the practicalities of its facilitation; benefits and limitations of the process?

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Overall, this study looks into using technology to aid peer and self-review of writing suggests that students require careful guidance in both the writing review process as well as the required technology. It also reveals that students do not necessarily find this learner-centered approach an intuitive process and were also not convinced that this is beneficial.

These findings remind us that technology in the classroom, for the purposes of writing instruction, does not supersede the role of the instructor. Students in this study felt that the teacher was a vitally important participant in the teaching and learning cycle. The students' responses, to the apps also indicate that students' preferences and opinions about the values and usability of technology are vitally important. Students need to be convinced that the application is purposeful and efficient.

The current study argues that apps can aid in the self and peer-editing process provided the students undergo well-planned step-by-step training. This would be helpful to the students as well as teachers who have major time constraints and are unable to give one-on-one effective feedback. Nevertheless, duplicating the process of this study must be done with a major limitation in mind: the students all wrote a problem-solution essay, which had been taught and discussed at length in class. Since all students were familiar with the requirements of this type of essay, the quality of their work was surely affected, which in turn influenced the self and peer-editing processes.

Finally, this research project has helped to highlight some of the possibilities of using technology to help students review their writing using collaborative and authentic methods. Conversely, it indicates that whilst students want functional, efficient applications they also require teacher input and support in using these. Nevertheless, there were definite improvements in terms of the quality of their writing. The essays improved from draft to final version. The editing devices helped them to notice more of their errors and the prospect of having their writing published on Edmodo prompted them to carefully prepare and check their essays. It is recommended that more training sessions on feedback are needed in order to increase the expertise and confidence of the student reviewers. However, as this is very time consuming, the curriculum of the course must allow for the necessary time to be integrated into the syllabus of the course.

REFERENCES

Fulton, K. (2012). Upside down and inside out: Flip your classroom to improve student learning. *Learning & Leading with Technology, 39*(8), 12-17.

Herreid, C. F. and Schiller, N. A. (2013). Case studies and the flipped classroom. *Journal of College Science Teaching, 42*(5), 62-66.

Iwanaka, T., Takatskuka, S. (2007). Influences of attention and noticing on second language acquisition. *Annual Review of English Language Education in Japan, 17*, 21-30.

Kalin, J. (2012). Doing what comes naturally? Student perceptions and use of collaborative technologies. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,* 6(1). doi:10.20429/ijsotl.2012.060110

Min, H. (2005). Training students to become successful peer reviewers. *System, 33*(2), 293-308.

Ministry for Federal National Council Affairs (2009). *Women in the United Arab Emirates. A Portrait of Progress*: http://lib.ohchr.org/HRBodies/UPR/Documents/Session3/AE/UPR_UAE_ANNEX3_E.pdf

Rahimi. M. (2013). Is training student reviewers worth its while? A study of how training influences the quality of students' feedback and writing. *Language Teaching Research, 17*(1), 67-89.

Trust, T. (2012). Professional learning networks designed for teacher learning. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education, 28*(4), 133–138. doi:10.1080/21532974.2012.10784693

Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1*, 217-133.

Schmidt, R. (2010). Attention, awareness, and individual differences in language learning. In Chan, W. M., Chin, K. N., Bhatt, S. K., and Walker, I. Istanto, J., (Eds). *Perspectives on individual characteristics and foreign language education.* (2012). Boston/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, Inc.

Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in second language: A case study of an adult learner in Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Suthiwan, & I. Walker, *Proceedings of CLaSIC 2010, Singapore, December 2-4* (pp. 721-737). Singapore: National University of Singapore, Centre for Language Studies.

Thompson, C. (2011). How Khan Academy is changing the rules of education. *Wired, 1*(1), 1-15. Retrieved from http://www.mendeley.com/research/khan-academy-changing-rules-education/

Van Lier, L. (2014). *Interaction in the language curriculum, awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. Pearson Education Limited: New York.

Van Lier, L. (1996). *Interaction in the language curriculum: Awareness, autonomy and authenticity*. London, UK: Longman.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT Press: Cambridge, MA.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

Zhu, W. (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication, 12*(4), 492-528.